



30578/R

L. Lxvi.

19 1j









# VACCINATION

VINDICATED

AGAINST

MISREPRESENTATION

AND

CALUMNY,

*IN A LETTER TO HIS PATIENTS,*

BY EDWARD JONES,

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS, AND  
SURGEON TO THE MONTGOMERYSHIRE  
VOLUNTEER LEGION.

---

WELSHPOOL, PRINTED:

RE-PRINTED FOR J. MURRAY, NO. 32, FLEET STREET,  
LONDON.

1806.

91896



WELLCOME

LIBRARY

WELLCOME

LIBRARY

WELLCOME

LIBRARY

WELLCOME

LIBRARY

WELLCOME

~~~~~  
S. Gosnell, Printer,  
Little Queen Street,  
~~~~~



## P R E F A C E.

---

**T**HE following Letter is the hasty composition of the few leisure moments which the Author could spare, amidst the laborious duties of an extensive country practice, and was never designed to pass the bounds of that circle to which it is addressed ; but a copy of it having accidentally fallen into the hands of a gentleman who interests himself in vaccination, he was pleased to express his opinion of it in very flattering terms, accompanied with a desire that it might be republished in London, as he thought the more extensive circulation of it likely to prove useful. Though the Author is not vain enough to suppose that his humble efforts can add much weight to the testimony already produced in favour of vaccination, he cannot refuse to comply with this request.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016

## VACCINATION VINDICATED,

&c.

---

**I** ADDRESS the following observations to you, as a reply to a pamphlet written by a Dr. Squirrel, which I have been informed has obtained pretty general circulation in this neighbourhood, and raised considerable anxiety in the minds of many families who had adopted the practice of vaccination. To my medical brethren I owe an apology for answering objections which they have unanimously treated with contempt; but the positive assertions and confident tone of language which this gentleman has assumed are so likely to impose upon those who have neither leisure nor opportunities to examine more authentic sources of information on the subject, that I think myself bound, in justice to my own opinions, and in duty to those who have been guided by them, to offer an antidote where such poison has been administered. If it were necessary to lay before you a comprehensive statement of all the advantages of vaccination, and the evidence by which they have been established,

I should leave the task to those who have more leisure and ability to undertake it: but such an elaborate work not being necessary to refute the objections of Dr. Squirrel, I do not fear incurring the imputation of excessive vanity in believing myself equal to what I have undertaken.

It would be neither liberal nor candid to question the purity of the motives of those who have contributed to give circulation to this extraordinary pamphlet; a very little reflection, however, might have convinced them, that, to depreciate a discovery sanctioned by the approbation of the British Parliament, and recommended for adoption by the united talents of all the medical men of character, not only of Great Britain, but of the whole civilized world, was not to be effected by so humble an instrument as Dr. Squirrel. The public are however indebted to them for their well-meant endeavours, as they will contribute to attract to the subject more of that public attention which its advocates court, confident that the merits of the discovery will ultimately place it beyond the reach of calumny and misrepresentation.

Dr. Squirrel claims credit for candour, humanity, and honour; but I fear the justice of his claim to the two former virtues will hardly be admitted, if left to rest on the testimony of his own writings; and professions of the latter are so universally prostituted to the purposes of empiricism and imposture, that I am obliged to acknowledge that the poet had too much reason indignantly to exclaim:—

Talk not of honour, 't is the cant of knaves,  
The specious covert for a thousand frauds,  
To pave the way to guilty eminence;  
But when its honest dictates guide the heart,  
It seldom 'scapes the lips of the possessor.

Those propositions in Dr. Squirrel's book, to which I wish particularly to call your notice, are,

“ 1st, That it is proved that the origin of cow-pox is the grease in horses.”

“ 2d, That the grease is a loathsome scrofulous disease.”

“ 3d, That the cow-pox when introduced into the human constitution, is a severe disease; that it produces scrofula, or some other injurious effects on the constitution.”

“ 4th, That inoculated small-pox is always a mild disease, and is never productive of any



bad effects ; but, on the contrary, improves the constitution."

" 5th, That small-pox matter has greater affinity to the human blood than cow-pox matter, and is therefore more congenial to the human constitution."

" 6th, That the cow-pox is not a preventive of the small-pox but for a certain time."

" 7th, That the advocates of vaccination were ignorant of the practice of inoculation, and therefore not competent judges of the comparative merits of the two modes of practice."

Not having Dr. Squirrel's pamphlet before me, I am obliged to state the above propositions from memory ; the *words* may not be exactly quoted, but I am certain that the substance is not misrepresented.

To the first assertion, I beg leave to observe, that it was very early *conjectured* by Dr. Jenner that the cow-pox originated in grease. The conjecture was certainly a probable one ; and for the sake of argument we will admit it to have been *proved*. We will admit the matter to have originated in the *plague itself* ; nay, we will even admit that Dr. Jenner dipped his first lancet into the most loathsome of all

compounds that was ever formed by the imagination of man, *into the infernal caldron of Shakespeare's witches*. We will admit the cow-pox to have had whatever origin *Dr. Squirrel* chooses to give; and then we will ask, *how does this lessen its value as a preventive of small-pox?* After having made such large admissions, we will beg leave to inform *Dr. Squirrel* that *things probable* are not *things proved*.

The proposition, "that grease is a loathsome scrofulous disease," is partly, but not wholly true. That grease is loathsome, as the itch is, the small-pox is, the *cacoethes scribendi*, and every other disease is, when attended with the formation and discharge of *loathsome* matter, no one will deny—but is it therefore scrofulous? or is there any evidence to shew the smallest resemblance, much less identity, between it and scrofula? *Dr. S.* says, the proof is taken from a comparison of the symptoms of the two disorders, as they are described in the best medical and veterinary writers; but as he has neither given us the names of the authors he alludes to, nor their definitions of the diseases, I think it expedient to fill up the blank from the best sources to which I have at present access. You may then judge

with how much fidelity the opinions of other men are represented by this *candid* Doctor.

*Sauvage* \* defines scrofula

“ A hardish swelling of the glands of the neck and mesentery, with the lips and nose thickened or swelled.”

*Vogel* † defines it

“ An indolent, obstinate swelling of the glands of the neck and mesentery.”

*Sagar* ‡ defines it

“ Hardish swellings of the glands of the neck or mesentery, with swelled lips and nose : scrofula is commonly softer than scirrhus.”

*Cullen* || defines it

“ Swellings of the lymphatic glands, especially those of the neck, the upper lip and

\* “ Tumor subscirrhosus glandularum colli mesenterique, labiis et naso crassioribus.” SAUVAGE.

† “ Tumor glandularum colli mesenterique indolens obduratus.” VOGEL.

‡ “ Tumores subscirrhosi glandularum colli mesenterique, cum labiis nasoque crassioribus : scrofula ordinario mollior est scirrhus.” SAGAR.

|| “ Glandularum conglobatarum præsertim in collo tumores, labium superius et columna nasi tumida, facies florida, cutis levis, tumidum abdomen.” CULLEN.



bridge of the nose swelled, the countenance florid, the skin delicate, the belly swollen."

*Darwin* has adopted the definition of *Cullen*.

*Townsend* defines it

"Swelled lymphatic glands, thick upper lip, obstinate ulcers, ophthalmia tarsi (inflammation of the eyelashes), indolent tumours on the joints, fair complexion, irritable habit."

Under the article *Farriery*, in the *British Encyclopædia*, I find grease described to be—"a swelling generally beginning in the fetlock joint of one of the hind legs, which, without care and the application of remedies, often terminates in deep cracks, and sometimes ulcers, which discharge an offensive matter."

Mr. *Taplin* is the only other author on the subject I have by me; but in his pompous verbosity I cannot discover any thing intelligible.

From the definitions above quoted, where, in the name of common sense, are we to find the least resemblance, much less an identity, of the two diseases? If there is any human disorder resembling grease, it is that inflammation, and sometimes ulceration of the feet and legs, called chilblains.

The proposition that comes next, viz. "that the cow-pox is a severe disease, &c." is so directly contradictory to what I have seen myself, so directly contradictory to the experience of every medical man with whom I am acquainted, so directly contradictory to all the *credible* evidence that has ever been published on the subject, that the hardihood of the assertion must excite astonishment in every person having the unprejudiced use of his understanding. There is scarcely a village that does not record instances of the inoculated small-pox having occasionally proved fatal; and yet Dr. Squirrel asserts it to be the milder disease! In my own practice of inoculation I have to lament the loss of two patients out of about two hundred; amongst upwards of three times that number of vaccinated patients, I have never had one to occasion me the least trouble or anxiety. My friend Mr. Jones, of Pool, who has practised medicine upwards of half a century, says, between the severity of the two diseases there is no comparison; he has often seen inoculation fatal; and much oftener seen it excite into action the latent seeds of scrofula; producing obstinate inflammations of the eyes, abscesses and ulcers difficult to heal, and sometimes caries and exfoliations of the bones. He

has never known such, or any other bad effects, to follow cow-pox. In a letter now before me from this respectable veteran of the profession, he says, "I am satisfied that cow-pox is a preventive of small-pox, and that whenever the latter disease has succeeded vaccination, it must have been owing either to the ignorance or negligence of the operator." The evidence of patients themselves, too often influenced by ignorance and prejudice, is seldom admissible, as the following curious instance amply proves.—A woman, whose family I had vaccinated, complained to me some months afterwards that her children had never been well since the operation was performed, and roundly attributed all their complaints to the cow-pox. When I was informed that their complaints were *measles* and *hooping-cough*, I could not help smiling at the good lady's simplicity. Such evidence as this, however, Dr. Squirrel, and some other Doctors *equally learned*, adduce, to overturn the resolutions of the House of Commons, bearing such honourable testimony to the merits of Dr. Jenner and his great discovery—resolutions by which the sum of ten thousand pounds was presented him by a grateful nation, as a reward for his successful and benevolent exertions in the cause

of humanity; and honourable as is the reward, all the world agree that it is very inadequate to the service.

A faithful summary of the evidence laid before the Committee on this important occasion, may not be uninteresting.

1st, The cow-pox is a mild local disease; and indeed can scarcely be said to deserve the name of a disease.

2d, It is not infectious, except by actual inoculation.

3d, It may be practised at any time of life, even during pregnancy; and at all seasons of the year.

4th, It requires no preparation, alteration in diet, or physic.

5th, It is not attended with danger, except from ignorance or neglect.

6th, It is a security against the small-pox; and, if its use becomes universal, must utterly extinguish that dreadful disease.

The above conclusions are drawn from the testimony of Sir George Baker, Sir Walter Farquhar, Drs. Ash, Blane, Woodville, Pearson, Marshall, Dale, Denman, Croft, Baillie, Skey,



Nelson, Thornton, Lister, Bradley, Sims, Saunders, Frampton, and Lettsom; which testimony was corroborated by Messrs. Home, Knight, Pope, Griffiths, Addington, Simpson, Jordan, Keate, Cline, Ring, and Taylor, all surgeons of eminence and character.

Dr. Woodville stated, that seven thousand five hundred had been vaccinated at the Small-pox Hospital up to January 1803; and half that number had since been inoculated without any effect.

Dr. Marshall had vaccinated upwards of ten thousand, many of whom were afterwards exposed to small-pox, which they resisted, &c. &c.

The Committee affirm, that those persons whom they examined, had both the most ample experience of facts, and the best means of forming a judgment upon them.

Can you forbear smiling, readers, when an attempt is made to depreciate such conclusions by the assertions of *Dr. Squirrel*, supported by the testimony of a few ignorant old women, who would be equally ready to assert that measles and hooping-cough are caused by vac-

cination, whenever they happen to follow it, or that day is caused by night, and night by day, because they follow each other in uninterrupted succession?

“ That inoculated small-pox is always a mild disease, &c. &c.” I consider this assertion sufficiently answered by what I have said under the last head; in addition to which I may venture to ask Dr. Squirrel, would he be bold enough to inoculate with small-pox a pregnant woman? It is known to every medical man that small-pox, under its very mildest form, generally occasions abortion. Suppose then that Dr. S. should be asked his advice respecting a woman in this delicate situation, who must be inevitably exposed to small-pox infection, would he inoculate, would he vaccinate, or would he leave his patient to the chance of taking the natural small-pox? Common charity compels me to believe that *even Dr. Squirrel* would sacrifice consistency to humanity.

That the small-pox occasionally improves a weakly constitution, I must admit; and that the cow-pox does the same thing, cannot be denied. There are in fact certain peculiar states of con-

stitution inconsistent with health, which the accession of many acute diseases contributes to remove; but the effect is not so certain as to induce physicians to place much reliance on any one disease as a cure for others. The opinion of the late celebrated John Hunter, which Dr. S. seems to have adopted, that "no two diseases can exist together," has been proved by observations subsequent to the time of that great man, to have been unfounded.

"That small-pox matter has more affinity to the human blood than cow-pox matter," may be true, though I see no other argument in favour of it than that the former disease is infectious, and the latter is not. The Doctor may possibly have other arguments, drawn from ingenious experiments on the fluids of living animals, the chemistry of which is a difficult and unexplored subject. Let, however, the human constitution, and its various diseases, pass through the ordeal of Dr. Squirrel's logic, and a necessary conclusion will be, that a man had better have the plague or yellow fever than a common cold or ague, because the former, being infectious, have a greater affinity to his blood, and are therefore more congenial to his

constitution than the latter, which are not infectious !!!

Had this *humane* Doctor written by the tyrannical commands of the infernal Robespierre, for the diabolical purpose of robbing the earth of its inhabitants, he could not have laid down more desolating principles.

Dr. Squirrel asserts that the cow-pox does not prevent the small-pox but for a certain time, and limits its prophylactic power to twenty-one years, without offering any reason for this particular period in preference to any other. Unfortunately, however, for this fine hypothesis, there are cases upon record, of aged persons who had, in the earlier part of their lives, been casually affected with cow-pox, resisting at very distant periods, every attempt to infect them with small-pox.

That the small-pox has sometimes followed what was *supposed* to be complete vaccination, no one will deny ; that it has also as frequently followed what was *supposed* to be complete inoculation, every experienced medical man can testify ; and cases might be quoted on each side, if any useful end were to be thereby obtained.



But these cases only shew that vaccination, as well as inoculation, has in a *few rare* instances deceived the expectations of its advocates; and these instances are comparatively *so rare*, that we are justified in concluding it to be much more likely that the observers themselves have *mistaken the diseases*, than that the laws of nature have deviated from that uniformity which they so constantly observe. The facts, as far as they can be relied upon, equally lessen our confidence in inoculation and vaccination; but are we therefore to relinquish both, and allow the natural small-pox to destroy and deform the rising generation, with all its native malignity? This would be acting as absurdly as if we were, in all common concerns of life, to neglect the usual means for obtaining our ends, because they have in a few rare instances proved inadequate.

Dr. Squirrel, affecting to believe that vaccination is an ineffectual and dangerous practice, endeavours to frighten parents into a belief that certain remedial measures are necessary to purge the constitution of its baneful effects, and *that it is their duty to submit the management of their children to him* until he shall, by drench-

ing them with mercury, restore the susceptibility of small-pox!! How various are the forms which quackery assumes, to delude its credulous victims! The more modest empirics, among whom Dr. S.\* formerly held a place, are content with occasionally puffing off their nostrums; but it remained for Dr. Squirrel of the present day, confidently to ask the public to *submit to his prescriptions for twenty-one years*, and for the very curious purpose of *making them susceptible of disease!!* Let Solomon and Brodum no longer claim pre-eminence in empiricism; the palm must now be yielded to the gigantic Squirrel, for, compared to him,

“ They’re but as mole-hills to the mighty Alps.”

Credulous as the multitude are, they surely have not yet reached such a pitch of infatuation as to submit to his *experiments!!*

“ That the advocates of vaccination were ignorant, &c.” is so completely answered by the names of those who gave evidence before the House of Commons, that I shall not waste your time by any other comment.

---

\* See Dr. Squirrel’s Essay on Indigestion.

Dr. Squirrel's strong expressions of disgust and horror at the loathsomeness of the origin of cow-pox resemble more the ravings of a nervous hypochondriac than the sober language of a physician, investigating a philosophical subject of the utmost importance to mankind. The real lovers of truth do not thus endeavour to mislead the judgment by declamatory appeals to passion and prejudice. What has the origin of cow-pox to do with its utility? An intelligent friend of mine observed, "if the origin of remedies were admitted as an argument against their use, we should annihilate at once the utility of medicine"—we should banish from our practice opium, antimony, hemlock, fox-glove, arsenic, &c. and all our most valuable medicines, on account of their poisonous qualities: we should, in short, commit an act of medical suicide. That Dr. Squirrel, the *candid*, *humane*, and *honourable* Dr. Squirrel, is not so scrupulous in the means he employs to obtain *his* ends, we have a right to conclude, from the testimony of his own writings—from his Treatise on Cow-pox, and another *equally learned* "Treatise" he published some years ago "on Indigestion," to both of which I take the liberty of referring you.

The very important duties which your kindness and partiality so constantly call upon me to discharge, allow me no time to give you more at length the very satisfactory evidence \* on which the practice of vaccination is recommended. If I have succeeded in removing from your minds the anxiety which the unsupported assertions of Dr. Squirrel had occasioned, I flatter myself that I shall have made some slight return for the many favours I have received, and for which I shall ever remain your faithful servant and sincere friend,

E. JONES.

*Dolforwin Hall, Dec. 23, 1805.*

---

\* As an instance of the effect of this evidence on a candid and enlightened mind, I take the liberty of quoting a letter to the Editors of the Medical and Physical Journal, from that distinguished surgeon Mr. Trye, of Gloucester, which is of itself sufficient to refute volumes of such pamphlets as Dr. Squirrel's :—

*“ To the Editors of the Medical and Physical Journal.*

“ GENTLEMEN,

“ When Dr. Jenner first introduced vaccine inoculation, I declined adopting it. Inoculation with the small-pox I had long practised without a single loss ; I had also fixed opinions in physiology, which



militated against what was advanced by himself and his friends. In process of time, however, such a mass of clear, undisputed, decisive evidence came forward in support of the newly-discovered preservative, as to be irresistible to a mind not hardened beyond the susceptibility of conviction ; and, consequently, whatever might have been my previous notions, or my habits of thinking, I could no longer persist in the use of variolous matter.

“ I will not say, that my own practice, in inoculating with cow-pox matter, has been so considerable as that of many others, or that I have made a variety of experiments, with a view to understand or explain any of the phenomena of the disease ; but I will say, that in the small-pox, both natural and inoculated, my experience has been ample ; and from that experience alone, I was enabled to compare the merits of small-pox inoculation with those ascribed to the Jennerian practice. From my own experience, then, I can assert, first, that whatever has been said against the sufficiency of cow-pox matter, as a security against variolous infection, may be also said with truth against small-pox matter, as a similar security.—From my own experience I can, secondly, assert, that the subsequent ill effects which have been said to follow cow-pox, have, in a ten-fold greater degree, followed small-pox.

“ In behalf of my first assertion, I can recollect numerous facts ; but, as I write for the public, and

on a most important subject, I will state nothing in support of that assertion, which shall rest solely upon my own credibility or memory; I will, therefore, confine myself to the three following cases:—

“ Mr. John Phillpott, of this city, well known and esteemed in his profession of the law, was inoculated with the small-pox in his infancy, together with an elder sister, by their father, with the same matter, at the same time, and both were nursed by the mother, and two persons accustomed to small-pox, of good judgment, and now living. The young lady had the disease to an alarming virulence; the boy’s arm inflamed, he was indisposed, and had four or five eruptions on different parts of his body; and Mrs. Phillpott says, they appeared to her to go on after the manner of other small-pox pustules. In his twenty-first year, I was desired to visit him as being ill with some eruptive fever. He had spots just appearing in different parts of his body; the next time I saw him, nothing but the positive assertion of himself and his friends, that he had had the small-pox, could have made me doubt that they were variolous. On the following day that doubt was entirely removed. He had a plentiful crop of pustules of the distinct kind, which went regularly through their stages of suppuration and scabbing.

“ In September 1794, I inoculated a daughter of Mr. John Rudhall, of this city, with matter which I had taken myself from a variolous subject. The

child's arm inflamed; she was indisposed, and had a few eruptions, which did not suppurate. About twelve months after, I inoculated her again, and she then had the distinct small-pox, with all its usual circumstances.

“ Mr. Cooke, an eminent apothecary of this city, desired me to see a patient, who had some years before been inoculated by a practitioner of respectability and experience, for the small-pox, together with ten others, in the gentleman's own small-pox house. The patient supposed that he then received and went through the disease, and the inoculator assured him of it. When we visited him, he was blind with small-pox, which went through its usual stages.

“ In support of my second assertion, I need not stake my own credibility at all. My experience can only coincide with the testimonies already before the public, of the small-pox rousing up scrofula in all its malignant varieties, and being followed by phlegmons, ophthalmias, &c. while nothing beyond cutaneous eruptions has, to the best of my recollection, been imputed to the cow-pox.

“ I shall go then to the inferences to be drawn from what has been premised. From the cases supporting the first assertion, it appears first, either that some individuals may receive the small-pox infection twice; or else, that the patient may be infected to a certain degree with variolous matter, but not so as to make an indelible impression on the constitution.

In either case, their inoculation with the small-pox has no advantage, as a protecting security, over the cow-pox. Let it be said, that the practitioner who inoculated the patient supposed to be infected a second time, was, in the first instance, either inattentive or deceived by doubtful appearances; or that the first time his patient was not inoculated with real small-pox matter, or with small-pox matter in a proper state. To the first supposition, it must be answered, that in the general practice of cow-pox inoculation, it is not to be believed that operators will be more sagacious, more discriminating, or more attentive than their predecessors have been in small-pox inoculation; and to the second, that similar errors are just as likely to prevail in vaccine inoculation. Hence the conclusion must be, either that there are individuals, in whom the susceptibility of the small-pox is not destroyed by a well-conducted process either of the cow-pox or small-pox inoculation; or that, in the instances when either the one or the other failed to secure the individual against future small-pox, the process did not go so far as to make the proper impression on the constitution; or lastly, that in the inoculation, improper matter must have been used, which, however, could not have been the case in the two first examples given above, in proving my first assertion.

“ Three instances have been brought forward, amidst the voluminous writings for and against the cow-pox inoculation, where it failed of securing the patient against small-pox; two by Mr. Goldson, of



Portsmouth, and one in the London Papers of the beginning of this month. Whether the patients were inoculated with genuine cow-pox matter or not, I shall not inquire; I will admit their weakening our confidence in vaccination to a certain degree. But these three failures, amid the collected experience of the profession in general, are here met by the experience of a single individual, in a provincial town, with an equal number of cases, equally weakening our confidence in small-pox inoculation. In this respect, then, let the two inoculations be supposed to stand upon equal grounds. But let the *consequences* of one be weighed against those of the other, and the scale of vaccination must incalculably preponderate.—In immediate danger to the individual, in remote mischief to his constitution, the cow-pox has infinitely the advantage.—To this let us add, that while with the cow-pox the practitioner, at the worst, injures no one except his patient, with the small-pox he may deal misery and destruction among his neighbours, far beyond the limits of his operations; that in the one he is continually risking the dissemination of a loathsome and mortal disease, while in the other he is contributing to the extermination of that pestilence from among mankind. Let us, then, turn to common sense, and ask her, which she would prefer?

“ I am, &c.

“ CHARLES BRANDON TRYE,

“ Senior Surgeon to the County Hospital.

“ Gloucester, Oct. 6, 1804.”



BOOKS printed for J. MURRAY.

---

A REPLY  
TO THE  
ANTI-VACCINISTS,

By JAMES MOORE,  
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,  
LONDON.

8vo. 2s. stitched.

---

OBSERVATIONS

ON

DR. PEARSON'S EXAMINATION

OF THE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

CONCERNING

DR. JENNER'S CLAIM FOR REMUNERATION.

Second Edition, enlarged, with a Preface.

By THOMAS CREASER, Surgeon.

8vo. 3s. stitched.

BOOKS printed for J. MURRAY.

---

THE  
EVIDENCE AT LARGE,

AS LAID BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,  
RESPECTING  
DR. JENNER'S DISCOVERY

OF  
VACCINE INOCULATION;

Together with the Debate which followed, and some  
Observations on the contravening Evidence, &c.

By the Rev. G. C. JENNER.

8vo. 4s. Boards.

---

AN  
ANSWER TO DR. MOSELEY;

CONTAINING  
A DEFENCE OF VACCINATION.

By JOHN RING,  
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,  
LONDON, AND OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETIES OF  
LONDON AND PARIS.

8vo. 6s. Boards.

BOOKS printed for J. MURRAY.

---

AN

ANSWER TO MR. GOLDSON,

PROVING

That Vaccination is a permanent Security against the  
Cow-Pox.

By JOHN RING,

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,  
LONDON, &c.

8vo. 1s. 6d. stitched.

---

A TRANSLATION of

ANSTY'S ODE TO JENNER;

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A COMPENDIUM OF VACCINATION;

CONSISTING OF

Two Tables, one shewing the Advantages of Vaccine  
Inoculation, the other containing Instructions  
for the Practice.

By JOHN RING,

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,  
LONDON.

1s. 6d. stitched.



BOOKS printed for J. MURRAY.

---

OBSERVATIONS  
ON  
SOME LATE ATTEMPTS TO DEPRECIATE  
THE  
VALUE AND EFFICACY  
OF  
VACCINE INOCULATION.

By SAMUEL MERRYMAN.

8vo. 1s. 6d. stitched.

---

AN ADDRESS  
TO THE  
MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS OF IRELAND,  
ON THE  
SUBJECT OF COW-POX.

By SAMUEL B. LABATT, M. D.

LICENTIATE OF THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, AND  
SECRETARY TO THE COW-POCK INSTITUTION,  
NORTH COPE STREET, DUBLIN.

12mo. 3s. 6d. sewed.

3  
S. GOSNELL, Printer, Little Queen Street.





























































































































